LEVEL ONE

The College of the Bible Quarterly

v.20:2-4
1943

CONTENTS

A NEW STRATEGY FOR OUR EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

Stephen Jared Corey

DISCIPLE CHARACTERISTICS FOR THESE TIMES

Herndon Wagers

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN A WARRING AND POST WAR WORLD

Myron Taggart Hopper

Vol. XX APRIL, 1943 No. 2

Entered as second-class matter December 18, 1937, at the Post Office at Lexington, Kentucky, under the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912

A QUARTERLY BULLETIN

Published in January, April, July, and October

by

The College of the Bible

Lexington, Kentucky

Additional copies of The Quarterly may be secured without cost by addressing:
The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

A NEW STRATEGY FOR OUR EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

STEPHEN JARED COREY*

Our educational institutions among the Disciples of Christ are facing the greatest danger that has ever confronted them. With the exception of a few colleges which have either been more fortunate with their endowment funds, or have become more largely municipal universities in their financial dependence, our schools are in a tragic dilemma. Unless our people come to the rescue during this period when the acceptance of service units from the military have for the time being furnished sufficient financial support for most schools to tide over temporarily, many of our colleges will face the disaster of discontinuance.

Such a tragedy would also gravely endanger our Bible colleges for the training of the ministry, as well as greatly depleting the stream of ministerial recruits at its source in the colleges. One of the alternatives under such circumstances would be to change the nature of the schools, lower the educational standards, make them less Christian in their curriculum and atmosphere and succumb to the secular, mechianized emphasis of this period.

One of the great misfortunes in the present situation lies in the fact that this supreme crisis comes at a time when our schools are less tied to our brotherhood through the churches than ever in their history. For this lack of intimate connection and appreciation of the people, both the colleges and our churches are to blame. Partly because of the inadequate way in which our people have supported our colleges and partly because the schools found other avenues of support which, for the time being, looked enticing, an ever widening gap between Christian constituency and school has resulted. The time has come for repentance both on the part of the institutions and the church and a new realization that Christian education is impossible without the hearty support of its Christian constituency, and likewise that the church is helpless in leadership and program without its sympathetic and closely allied schools. It would seem that the dangers which the schools face would fall under

*President and Professor of Missions, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

three categories, namely: secularization, regimentation or possible liquidation.

There has been a tendency in the past, more especially since the first world war, for all society to become more secularized and for divine reality to be left out of life. The colleges, caught in this stream of negation which was flowing so strongly through our civilization, were effected by it. That is, religion and religious teaching became less and less a vital factor on the school campus. In more recent years there has been a decided change, and church colleges realizing the danger of the situation have begun to deal actively with the problem in their campus plans and in the introduction of more teaching in the curriculum in the realm of religion. College administrators and instructors have begun to show deep anxiety in this matter. Now, added to the danger, we have regimentation for all-out war which has come to most of our college campuses. Necessary as it is for the moment and welcome as the new supporting funds are, this largely ties the hands of the schools in their broad liberal arts program. Not only is this so for the time being, but the danger also confronts the schools of the continuance of an over balanced mechanistic and scientific curriculum in the post war period, because many of the governmental requirements will no doubt continue in after-war education. If our colleges remain tied into this sort of a technical and pro-scientific program for any long period, it will largely spell the doom of their cultural, liberal arts outlook. The only possible freedom from it is sufficient financial and moral support to reestablish and strengthen the liberal education for which the Christian college stands. This support can only come from the churches.

The liquidation of the church college and its disappearance from the framework of American life would be a disaster beyond compute. Admitting the mistakes which have been made in the educational program and on the other side the paltry support of its institutions afforded by the churches, nevertheless the foundation for Christian leadership for the church, and in a large measure for society, has emanated from the Christian college. If the Christian college disappears and along with it the high idealism and freedom of Christian temper in education and there is substituted for it the drab and mechanized education which is largely determined by economics and material necessity, where will our future leaders come from who are equipped to chart the course for society? The Christian school has al-

ways been essential. It is now far more necessary to our future good than ever before.

Having described the dangers which the church school faces, what are the necessities of the case in order that the critical danger may be avoided? Here, again, there would seem to be three stipulations necessary for the continuation and vitality of our colleges. These lie in identification, justification, and support. By this, I mean there must be a real and vital identifying of our colleges with the church so that each will recognize that they belong to each other and greatly need each other. In the second place, there must be a thorough-going purpose and plan on the part of the schools to justify their existence as Christian institutions and thus, at the same time, justify a challenge to the churches to support them. Their educational program and their teaching and atmosphere must be so thoroughly Christian, ethical and idealistic, that they provide something distinctive, and necessary which is not provided by the tax supported secular institutions which surround them. And then a third necessity. Our schools must be undergirded financially by our churches and our church constituency. There is no other way. While endowment and student tuitions will always need to be a large factor in support, the real saving and steadily supporting financial increment must be from church offerings. It must be the substantial margin which provides stability and which keeps church and school in the same stream of Christian life and idealism. Our brotherhood's history and growth is indissolubly linked with our colleges, universities and Bible training schools. Without them there could have been no great movement known as the Disciples of Christ. They have provided the leadership for the ministry and through it, as well as from the schools themselves, the leadership in the pews. For the future, facing an unmeasured world crisis the church will need the colleges as never before in our history. There must be a reidentification of churches and schools, a new justification of our educational institutions in a revitalizing of their Christian program and atmosphere and a repentance of our churches for their aloofness and unconcern about their own colleges and training schools.

The present pitifully small support of our schools, which comes to them in the very meager percentages from Unified Promotion, is hopelessly insufficient. Realizing this and the grave emergency which faces our colleges, the Board of Higher Education has petitioned the Brotherhood Commission on Bud-

gets and Promotional Relationships for the privilege of going directly to the churches for offerings, over and above that given through the unified program. This request has been granted. It is the plan of the Board of Higher Education, under the leadership of John L. Davis, its efficient secretary, to spend the major part of the next missionary year in a program of education among the churches, bringing them to a realization of the crisis and needs of the colleges and following that the schools, each in its own area, will approach the churches for the necessary contributions. It would seem that such a program of enlightenment and support is absolutely necessary and the only way out of our present tragic educational dilemma.

DISCIPLE CHARACTERISTICS for THESE TIMES

HERNDON WAGERS*

In a discussion of Disciple characteristics for these times one sees immediately two possible approaches, both of which are legitimate. One may, for instance, begin with Disciple characteristics and then proceed to analyze our times in light of their suggestions. Or, one may first analyze our times, morally and spiritually, ascertain our basic needs, and then proceed to a consideration of how and where Disciple principles are relevant. We choose the latter method. Obviously, it is more inclusive. But it is also valuable in that it focuses attention upon those factors in Disciple tradition which are most pertinent to our time and its need. No religious group gives equal emphasis to all of its principles at a given time or period. Some are dormant, all but forgotten, until the exigencies of a contemporary scene call them into activity. This will undoubtedly hold true for the Disciples in some degree. It may be that some Disciple characteristics for this hour are characteristics which, to be sure, are our tradition, but which we have not been emphasizing with the force and conviction that our times demand. But then there will be time enough to deal with this when we get to it; what we want to note here is a method of procedure, namely, that we shall begin not with a presentation of Disciple principles but with an analysis of our times.

Yet, for fear we may appear to have carved out for ourselves a task quite beyond our powers, a further qualification should be made. It is clear that anyone who attempts to speak in tones of assurance about the nature of the post-war world is not only rash but limited in his grasp of the complexity of the contemporary scene. Assuming, as we do, an Allied victory does not greatly simplify the problem. But this does not mean that we are utterly in the dark concerning the moral and spiritual issues we are facing. There are tendencies along certain lines in this sphere, some pretty definite tendencies, and one can be fairly safe in saying that whatever the shape of things to come (again assuming an Allied victory) it will of necessity take cognizance of these trends.

Undoubtedly, the first and foremost moral and spiritual

---

*Professor of Philosophy and Religion, Transylvania College.

need of our times is a renewing and strengthening of our faith in man. This does not mean that we are to trust in man instead of God, but rather that we are to keep faith in those qualities in man which are the very ground for our faith in God. Our conception of man is the prime factor in determining our conception of God, or whether we have such a conception at all—and, vice versa, our conception of ultimate reality, that is, God, is going to be a determining factor in our conception of man. This, I recall, was a basic tenet in the teaching of Dr. Snoddy. The spiritual forces operative in man are our fundamental testimony to the reality of God, while our conception of God as ultimate reality, is the determining factor in our evaluation of man. What we are driving at here is that if we lose faith in man we have cut the driving line of a realistic faith in God, the God "in whom we live and move and have our being." And this in turn means that we have, in effect, surrendered our spiritual birthright and opened the gates to a purely materialistic pattern of life.

But, someone will say, What about Barth? Does not Karl Barth disparage man and extol God? To give a very full consideration to this question would, of course, be to digress too far from our main purpose. There is good ground for maintaining, however, that in discrediting man, Barth has also cut his connections with God. In fact, he himself declares that God is unknown and utterly unknowable. Well, might one ask, then, how one knows that He exists at all, or, at least, how one knows when one is doing His will? And it is significant that Barth recognizes the legitimacy of this latter question and acknowledges that we can't know what God's will is. So, while Barthians themselves won't admit it, most of us feel that a depraved man and an incomprehensible God is little short of setting a demolition crew at work on the universe. We might say of Barth as did Caesar of Cassius, "He thinks too much."

But it is undoubtedly true that a premium is set today upon a continuing faith in the improvability and spiritual potentialities of man. To possess this faith means to believe man is essentially rational, that altruistic ideals have real status and are actually determining factors in human conduct and human development. If there is good cause to believe this, and the writer believes there is, it cannot be denied, on the other hand, that there is also ample ground for disbelieving it. Nazi Ger-

many ceased to believe it a decade ago when Hitler substituted the Volkgeist (the spirit of the people) for discursive thought. "We do not think with our brain," said Hitler, "we think with our blood." In other words, Nazi Germans do not live by reasoned and reasonable principles (and we would not include here all Germans), but by opportunism, German opportunism. Whatever they feel is for the good of the Germans as a race is the determining factor in all decisions. Principles, consistency, reasoned deliberation in determining right and wrong—these have no place in their thinking. In other words, the Nazis have lost faith in the dignity of man. Men do not think in order to find the right course to take, they think only in order that they may find the shortest distance to the fulfilling of their desires. Altruistic ideals are only subterfuges, instruments of deception. But there must be some form of order even when you don't believe in reason and ideals. To be sure, there must—so Germany has a dictator, Der Fuehrer, and it is his job to express the desires of Germans, as a people, for them. In others words, he is the voice of the body populace. If an individual doesn't agree with *the voice*, that means that he is thinking with his brain instead of his blood and must be liquidated at the State's earliest convenience. Is it any wonder that the Nazis no longer have any use for the Christian God? They no longer have a man that could make contact with a spiritual Father. The Christian God is excess baggage to the Nazi German—there isn't anything left for him to do.

We have gone to some length in describing the German disillusionment, not particularly because we happen to be at war with Germany, but because it represents an acid that has eaten deep into the soul of 20th Century culture. The reasons for this disillusionment are not difficult to trace. Conflicts and tensions within society have played a part. We upbraid Germany, and rightly so, for her reversion to barbarism, but there can be little doubt but that the attitudes and policies of France and England toward Germany after the last war, and the apathy of the United States toward these repressive measures, were important factors in preparing the soil for German disillusionment about the dignity and spiritual potentialities of man.

The new "depth" psychology—Freudianism—has also played a role. Freud has directed our attention away from the

realm of the conscious and has opened to us the amazing merchandise of the subconscious. It seems that people live out of their cellars in more ways than one. Not our rational faculties, not our ideals, but the deep dark recesses of the subconscious, the libido, are the determining factors in human conduct.

And, to continue, an intellectual pessimism has come to some on the heels of an expanding science. The Psalmist looked out upon his universe, the sun, the moon, and the stars, and with proper humility inquired, "What is man?" He was able to assert his faith a little later and say, "Thou hast made him a little lower than God: and crowned him with glory and honor." A noble affirmation of faith, we say, and yet we realize that a modern man is put to a harder task. He sees not only himself a speck set in the midst of a universe, but his universe a speck in interstellar space. And not only so, but the biologist has emphasized our lowly origins and made us conscious of our animal heritage. Again, the cry, What is man? Nowhere has this pessimism been more boldly expressed than in our modern literature. What is Man? asks one novelist and critic of note: "An ape reft of his tail and grown rusty at climbing"; "a parasite on the thin rind of a planet that swings silently through interstellar space"; "an ape who chatters to himself of kinship with the archangels while filthily he digs for ground nuts".*

Such, then, are some of the manifestations and causes for skepticism about man, and we do well not to take them lightly. If there is a skepticism abroad in the world today about God and religious principles, it undoubtedly has its roots in a loss of faith in man. The underlying religious problem of this hour, then, is, to the mind of the writer, the question of faith in the spiritual capabilities and hence the improvability of man. Are men "sons of God", possessing, in spite of all their fallibilities and sinfulness, the spiritual potentialities which may make real advances in the building of the Kingdom of God?

Before inquiring into Disciple qualifications for meeting this problem, let us point up the issue a little in respect to the positive possibilities of the situation. Just what is implied in a re-affirmation of faith in man? We had best admit, in the first place, had we not, that our pessimists about man are not without grounds for their position? We do act irrationally

*Vernon Louis Parrington, "The Incomparable Mr. Cabell", Main Currents in American Thought (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1930) Vol. III, p. 338.

much of the time; our ideals aren't always the altruistic instruments we claim they are, all too frequently being the magician's foil whereby attention is directed away from the real business at hand; it is true, too, that our culture at some points is only skin deep and that underneath lurks the savage and the law of the jungle. These are facts, and if there is any legitimacy in our claims to kinship with archangels, it might well become us to admit that the relationship is no better than a distant cousin. We are what we are, and not a whit better.

On the other hand, the converse is also true: we are what we are, and not one whit worse. Men, for all their frailties and fallibilities, do think honestly and with accurate aim on occasion; they do aspire to higher values, and do strive for ideals with integrity of mind and heart; they do transcend the law of the jungle and build communities based upon respect for and duty to their fellow men, frequently lifting respect to the level of love and duty to the level of sacrifice. The issue, then, is not which is true, man's goodness or his badness. Both are true! The question is which are we going to emphasize? To which assumption are we going to lend greater weight in the building of our corporate life?

It is the writer's conviction that our only hope for civilization and for the kingdom of God is through an affirmation of faith on the side of man's potential goodness, that is, his potential rationality, his potential moral integrity, his potential capacities for building a decent world society here on this battle torn earth. We can, and must, allow for error, frailties and wickedness, but we must not allow these darker facts to set the pattern for our thinking, planning, and evaluations. To do so is to lose both man and God, that is, to lose God in His truest and most spiritual character.

We are indebted to William James for a true and profound insight in respect to this problem. In an essay titled, "The Will to Believe," he described these recurring situations in human experience when we are faced with two alternatives, both of which have evidence to support them. We are forced to act on one premise or the other. But it may make a profound difference in consequence as to which premise we choose. Bid then the "tender light of faith to shine"; that is to say, throw the force of your will on the side of the values you deem most worthy, and the chances are in favor of your faith making the possi-

bility a reality. The theory has its limitations, but surely it has real application for the problem we are considering.

And now, finally, where do the Disciples stand in relation to this crucial problem? As the writer sees it, the Disciples, if they make explicit the fundamental principle which has been implicit in their movement from the beginning, are better equipped for the present emergency than any group in Christendom. This is a bold assertion, but let us look at the facts. What is it that was most significant in the thinking of the Disciples, in both Stone and Campbell, from the beginning? Their abrogation of creeds and elevation of the Bible as their sole authority, comes to mind immediately. But no, important as this is, it doesn't exactly state the heart of the matter. The fundamental characteristic of the Disciples was their insistence upon the right of every individual to interpret the Bible in the light of his own best understanding, that is, the priesthood of all believers. Did this mean that all men would correctly interpret the Scriptures? Not at all! It was incumbent upon every sincere person to qualify himself to the best of his ability in the use of the tools of biblical exegesis, and, furthermore, to get all the help he could from others whose background and experience could supplement his own. But in the final analysis the decision and interpretation were his own.

Granted, not all who have borne the name Disciple have given consistent and courageous backing to this principle. Sometimes the principle has been qualified with a "yes, but..." It is interesting to note, however, that these who have insisted upon this "yes, but..." haven't granted the same privilege to Baptists, Presbyterians, and others of Calvinistic lineage. As a matter of fact, every dogmatic group in Christendom, both past and present, has built its authoritarian position upon this qualified "yes, but..." Yes, the Scriptures are the sole authority, *but* this is what they mean. However, we are not concerned to argue this point further. We have only to quote from Thomas Campbell's "Declaration and Address" to show that we are treading upon sound historical ground. "We can neither take offense at our brother for his private opinions, if he be content to hold them as such; nor yet offend him with ours, if he does not usurp the place of lawgiver; and even suppose he should, in this case we judge him, not for his opinions, but for his presumption."[1] "We again are persuaded that as no man can be

(1) A. W. Fortune, **Adventuring With Disciple Pioneers; The Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1942, pp. 18f.**

judge for his brother; so no man can judge for his brother; but that every man must be allowed to judge for himself, as every man must bear his own judgment: must give an account of himself to God—we are also of the opinion that as the divine word is equally binding upon all as all lie under an equal obligation to be found by it, and it alone; and not by any human interpretation of it, therefore, no man has a right to judge his brother."[1] Still again, "But that all the members should have the same identical views of all divinely revealed truth, or that there should be no differences of opinion among them, appears to us morally impossible, all things considered. Nor can we conceive what desirable purpose such a unity of sentiment would serve."[1]

Well, what does all of this add up to, as concerns the need of our time? It means that the Disciples are close to the good earth in their evaluation of man. Man, the individual man, is not infallible but he has potentialities and we will look to the future with a greater emphasis upon the potentialities than upon the fallibilities. So long as Disciples are true to this their highest principle there will be no running to cover on their part, no searching for a highly abstract, metaphysical salvation as a refuge from the wiles of an irrational and unpredictable man. The world of today needs an "aye-saying" people—a people, who if only a remnant, keep their heads up, discerning God not behind them or off in the vacuous realm of space, but beside them and ahead of them. The Disciples proved themselves to be such a people, an "aye-saying" people, when they decried the authoritarianism of creedal religion and looked to the integrity and understanding of the individual man. The same spirit and faith which made them adequate for that day qualifies them for this.

We come now to what, in the mind of the writer, is the second basic need of our time, namely, a Christian appeal which is so simple and direct that no one can gainsay its relevance, and yet which because of its lack of subtlety and its direct bearing upon experience, has a freshness and power that makes it hard to resist. The Disciple cause was founded upon a plea for Christian unity. It is a sin for the body of Christ to be divided, with a spirit of contention and animus existing between groups which bear the name Christian. So felt the early followers of Campbell and Stone, and so feel we today. But the specific nature of

the problem of Christian division has changed in one important respect from what it was with our Disciples forbears. We no longer see Christian division as a sin for which God may some day punish us but rather as a sin for which we are now being punished. Christian groups are coming to a belated realization that the greatest foe to their spiritual interpretation of life is not other religious groups, but something more insidious and more powerful than an opposing religious group could ever be, namely, the materialism of a secular culture.

The historical era commonly called the Modern Period dates back roughly about 300 years to the Enlightenment which had its beginnings in the 17th Century. The most significant phenomenon of this period has been the development of what we call modern science. But, unfortunately, modern science received a materialistic bent in its earliest stages. Rene Descartes (1596-1650) while rendering an important service in his telling blows at the philosophical scheme underlying authoritarian Catholicism, achieved his success at a greater cost than he himself realized. The details of his system need not concern us here beyond pointing out that his final conclusions left us in a position where we could affirm nothing to be true which could not be given logical or mathematical demonstration. That this is a narrow and circumscribed interpretation of reality, and of science itself, is now vigorously maintained in many scientific quarters, but even so, the seeds of scepticism have made an indelible mark upon Western culture.

If we would summarize the effects of this situation on the spiritual message of the Church, we might make the following observations. First, that the materialistic tendency has served to stunt the imaginative and idealistic capacities of those strongly influenced by it. When people will countenance only that which is susceptible of mathematical or logical demonstration they are thereby ruling out the qualities of human experience as legitimate factors in interpreting reality. The result is that those very qualities upon which we depend for richness of experience and a meaningful life are given a very questionable status. This means that many scientifically inclined persons become unnecessarily and unjustifiably glued to earth, looking with suspicion upon projects of an imaginative and idealistic nature. In the second place, this materialistic tendency in modern society has served to discredit religion in the eyes of many

people. The reason for this is fairly obvious but we shall elaborate on it later. And, thirdly, materialism has either weakened the allegiance or completely alienated from the Church a class of people whom the Church most needs, namely, the educated class. We say this without any intention of disparaging one group or glorifying another. But it is clear that those positions in society which wield greatest influence in setting the pattern for modern society are held by educated people. The Church needs these people if it is to take seriously its mission for building the Kingdom of God.

Here, again, let us point up the problem a bit more clearly before inquiring into Disciple qualifications for meeting it. We have attempted to suggest the weakness and dangers of materialism, so let us now inquire into the possible weaknesses of organized Christianity in dealing with the situation. Undoubtedly, the problem is two-sided. But before going directly at the Church angle let us make one further observation about the scientific mind. Let us note, for instance, that there is more than one way of describing the scientific mind. We have directed attention to the interpretation of science in materialistic terms. It is science so conceived that we recognize as the foe of religion and ultimately of the good life in any reasonable way of conceiving it. But materialism is an addendum to science, a highly presumptive addendum, which is not essential to the scientific discipline in its basic sense. Science may be conceived as essentially a method, a manner of procedure for obtaining reliable data about nature and ourselves, data which furnishes us with a trustworthy criterion for predicting the consequences of a given set of relationships.

Now there can be no question but that the scientific method, the empirical procedure, has rendered inestimable benefits to mankind. Not only has it freed us from diseases and terrors of one kind or another that once leaped out upon us from the dark, it has also relieved the mind of many ungrounded ideas which falsified life, taboos, superstitions, inhibitions, etc. The fundamental character of this scientific method is, of course, quite simple. The scientist faces his problem, gathers all available data relative to it, forms an hypothesis as to its possible meaning, experiments thoroughly to prove or disprove his hypothesis, relates his conclusions to the already existing body of verified data. The important thing for our consideration here is that

the scientist does not allow absolute authority to any claim which cannot submit itself to, and verify itself by, this empirical procedure.

What then is the implication of this for religion? Well, doubtless most of us will agree that the religious man cannot hold in abeyance his faith in the trustworthiness of Christ as his spiritual guide with the same disinterested, impersonal attitude that the scientist takes toward his hypothesis. We bet our lives on Christ, and don't ask that all the returns be in before making the venture and the commitment. In the final analysis, religion does have faith as its essential characteristic. And we rightfully expect that every person who calls himself Christian be willing to make the same venture and the same commitment. But, having said this, we must now be prepared to make a concession, and a rightful one it would seem, to the spirit of the scientific man. It is this: that no person or group of persons has a right to say just what specific conception another man shall hold of what it means to follow Christ. Every man has the right, religiously speaking, to come to his understanding of Christ through the fires of his own personal experience. There are dangers in this principle, to be sure. However, abrogate this principle and the doors are open for the most divisive type of dogma in Christendom, namely, that dealing with the person of Christ, a dogma which when once established leads on to dogmas about everything under the sun.

It is exactly at this point that many churches have shown their greatest weakness in dealing with scepticism and materialism. They have insisted that everyone accept first all the dogmas about Christ, i. e., their dogmas, and the experience of their truth can come later. But we simply cannot challenge the critical mind of our time with such an appeal. If the personality of Christ isn't convincing enough to permit an individual to make his commitment in the light of his own insight and understanding, without the mediatorship of some other human mind and opinion, then these tough-minded individuals will have none of the Church, nor an ear for anything it says. Then so much the worse for them! Yes, perhaps so, but also so much the worse for the Kingdom Christ came to proclaim.

Here then is the picture. We have a populace which has over a number of years been becoming increasingly critical with

the expansion of education. Dogmas, of any kind, are looked upon with no more than tolerance at best and with contempt at worst. On the other hand, we have, what one fears is a great majority of the Churches in Christendom insisting that they have the medicine that can save the world, but it is contained in a neat little capsule and must be swallowed whole without any reservation. One may say that this is exactly what we do when we take the doctor's prescription—we accept on faith the trustworthiness of the doctor's judgment. But will the analogy stand? We accept a doctor's prescription because in the broad sense there is an agreement among doctors as to what will cure or kill in respect to a certain disease—an agreement based upon controlled experiment. We would not feel so comfortable if the medical profession were divided into hostile camps, each offering its own antidote as the only possible cure, while insisting that the medicines of all rival doctors were poisonous or ineffectual at best. In such a dilemma we might be tempted to refuse any medicine and just let nature take its course.

Unfortunately this is what has been happening to an alarming degree with respect to religion in the modern world. Many people, far too many, have been saying, "We cannot make sympathetic contact with a dogmatic form of thought. There is always the question of which dogma to accept. Furthermore the acceptance of one means the stultification of further inquiry. Consequently, we will leave religion to those who have an affinity for authoritarianism and for our part let nature take its course." And, to "let nature take its course", in respect to a world view, means to follow the line of least resistance, which is an incipient materialism.

The writer realizes that he may be accused of overstating the case, and in a sense he admits that he is. Liberal Protestantism today is not dogmatic in any offensive manner. There is no attempt on the part of these Churches to stuff unpalatable doctrines down the throats of their members. On the whole, there is a real sanity in liberal Protestantism on such matters. Yet, be this as it may, the theological heritage of most Christian groups is of such a nature that they are hardly in a position to make a crusade for a genuine and consistent liberal religion. And the need for this hour is for such a crusade. We cannot afford to allow materialism to run loose, under the assumption that when it has performed its work of destruction there will

be an awakening to its error. There will be an awakening, to be sure, but there is no guarantee that men will turn to Christianity as the alternative. The world is full of "isms" today just waiting for an opening wedge.

A Christian Crusade is needed in this hour. But the writer must confess that he trembles for the future when he thinks of such a crusade being launched as a call for commitment to some imposing theological formulation of Christian faith. It may, to be sure, gain many adherents. But while it gains these, it is at the same time enlarging the gap between the Christian Church and this strategic group of critically and sceptically minded men and women. We return then to our original premise, namely, that a basic need of this hour is for a Christian appeal which is so simple and direct that no one can gainsay its relevance and yet because of its lack of subtlety and its direct bearing upon experience, has a freshness and power which make it hard to resist.

Are the Disciples qualified to meet this need? The answer again is "yes", and not only so, but better qualified than any group in Christendom. The driving power of the Disciples in their formative years lay in just this point. True, they expressed this attitude in a somewhat different mental framework from ours today, but the essential spirit was there, and was their most characteristic feature. What was their program? An abrogation of creeds in any and all forms with an introduction of the individual to the fountain-head itself, namely the Christ of the New Testament. If we seem to be repeating what has already been stated about the Disciples the answer would have to be that, after all, when we emphasize the accountability of the individual to Christ, and Christ alone, we have just about summed up that which makes the Disciples distinctive and unique. But this basic principle does have many facts of application. We have noted that it means, for one thing, sufficient faith in man's potentialities for granting him this liberty and insisting that he exercise it. We now see the principle as setting the pattern for the appeal of the Disciples to a sceptical generation. And that appeal is simply this: that one acknowledge his allegiance to Christ and his willingness to follow him to the best of his understanding and ability. True, this may mean a poverty of religious experience for some people but the principle holds that there is no authority in heaven or earth that can force goodness, and the individual must be allowed to search out the riches of Christ

and his teaching in the light of his own integrity and on the level of his own experience.

And Disciples at their best have recognized this and insisted upon it as an active principle. Note again, the spirit of Thomas Campbell in his "Declaration and Address:"

"Every sincere and upright Christian will understand and do the will of God, in every instance, to the best of his skill and judgment; but in the application of the general rule to particular cases, there may, and doubtless will, be some variety of opinion and practice. This we see was actually the case in the apostolic churches without any breach of Christian unity."[2]

And, to get even more to the point, observe the words of Alexander Campbell, written at the height of his powers, twenty-eight years after the publication of the "Declaration and Address":

"It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known."[3]

This emphasis upon the personality of Christ and personal commitment has always had an appeal to both the heart and mind of men of all degrees. Here is one thing that speaks for itself: it is, as Emerson characterized beauty, its own excuse for being. The trouble begins when this personality is weighted down with Greek and Medieval metaphysics. The Disciples from the beginning eschewed such metaphysics as impedimenta for the real business of life. Alexander Campbell was not a student of John Locke without effect. And if we haven't always been true to this Lockian background it is nevertheless there as the most distinctive intellectual root of our movement. We are, therefore, doing nothing more than affirming our own best tradition when we base our appeal on the simple challenge, "Follow Christ."

The appeal is simple, clear, and fundamental. The Master himself asked for nothing more when he chose his disciples. We have no record of their having been put through any test other than an expression of confidence in their willingness to follow him and espouse his cause. But the strength of Jesus' appeal

(2) A. W. Fortune, op. cit., p. 18.

(3) W. E. Garrison, **Religion Follows the Frontier** (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1931) p. 165.

to his disciples lay in the fact that he made them see the deeper meaning of the simple experience of life as they knew it. He made them see the life within the life they were living, lifting their common experiences out of the context of a mundane existence into the rarefied atmosphere of a spiritual perspective. He did not attempt to introduce them to God through the dogmas of Judaistic law, but rather pointed out to them the marks of God's creative spirit in the life of everyday. By parable and the example of a discerning and appreciative spirit he gave them eyes with which to see and ears with which to hear. Is it any wonder that he spoke as one having authority, and made men's hearts burn within them? Life's experiences had a freshness they had not hitherto possessed.

And the richness of his appeal is still the strength of the Christian message. The sceptical mind of our times will not countenance the appeal of dogma but it will answer to the challenge of a personality; it will not respond to the hackneyed phrases of pious platitudes but it will quicken to a disclosure of the spiritual qualities and meanings of the experiences of the common life. The Disciples are preeminently qualified for this vital approach. Any group in Christendom *can* take this approach, but the Disciples stand in the peculiar position of being able to present this appeal without having to apologize for it. And it is this; this "open" tradition, which makes the Disciples distinctive for these times.

In conclusion, the writer believes that we Disciples not only have a spiritual foundation consonant with the most urgent needs of our times, but that we have a message which needs to be expounded, to be shouted from the housetops. Men need to know that the Christian message does not sound a note of defeat, either by emphasizing man's disabilities or God's impatience. They need to be made to realize, furthermore, that admission into the Lord's vineyard is not narrowly restricted but is granted to any sincere worker. As E. S. Ames says, a strategy is needed whereby it is difficult not to get into the Church but to get out of it. The Disciples have *real* answers for *real* contemporary needs. But the answers must be *emphasized.* Men do not "light a lamp and put it under a bushel, but on the stand that it may shine unto all that are in the house."

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN A WARRING AND POST WAR WORLD[1]

MYRON TAGGART HOPPER*

1. In its original form this paper was written for the Berea Institute for Vacation and Week Day workers in religious education. The original title was "Citizen's for Tomorrow's World". The original manuscript has been slightly revised, but much that was included to point what was said to a particular group is still included.

When I was first approached about speaking on this subject I refused. I refused because I felt incapable of saying anything in the area in which I was asked to speak which would be anything other than the "same old stuff".

Now I have no objections to "the same old stuff" which we have been saying with respect to our work in religious education. It has been very good stuff and until we begin to do what it calls for much more thoroughly, it needs to be repeated. I hesitated to come to this institute in response to the invitation I received and repeat it, however, because of a feeling that those who were planning the institute were looking for something fresh and challenging in relation to religious education in this war period and in the post war period to follow. It was suggested that I should give guidance in relation to the bewildering problems children and young people face in these times, with special attention to the problem of building an attitude of cooperation in those who are to participate in our religious educational activities so that they will be able to help win the peace.

I do not have anything basically new to suggest and I feel it encumbent upon me to confess that such is the case. I say this because it does not seem to me that being in war, and facing post war reconstruction, makes any difference in the basic procedures of religious education. Times like these do necessitate a changing of what can be termed the content of religious education. Greater attention must be given to the problems and experiences which people face with special urgency in these days. But, so far as I can see, the basic procedures of religious education, (not those which have been the predominant practice, but those which have been advocated by religious education leaders), have not changed as a result of our being in a war torn world. Adequate religious education is still a matter of enriching and controlling and guiding the experiences of people so as to help them become increasingly religious in *all* their adjustments to life. It is not a matter of transferring the content of the Bible

*Professor of Religious Education, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

from printed pages to the memory of growing persons. It is not a matter of making persons competent in reciting a creed. It is not a matter of bringing growing persons to the place where they will give intellectual assent to certain ideas about the Bible, or the nature of Jesus, or of the church. It is not a matter of training persons in the liturgies, and rituals, and ceremonies, of the church, and of making them willing to participate in these. It is not even a matter of getting them to attend church, or read the Bible every day, or engage in a daily devotional period, or in some form of specialized religious activities. All of these have, or can have, a great contribution to make to the religious education of persons but they are not religious education. They are means to an end and that end, as has been suggested above, is the enrichment and guidance and control of the experience of growing persons so that they may be able to live religiously in *all* areas of life.

Furthermore, being in a war torn world has not altered the great truths and values which are the bases for the adjustment to life which religious education (and at this point it would be more accurate to say Christian education) seeks to aid persons in achieving. We still hold that the most adequate terms we have to describe God, as inadequate as they are, as a result of the inadequacy of our language, is to speak of him as like a Loving Father God. We still hold that He is the Father of all men and that consequently all men are our brothers—yes even Japanese and Germans and Italians. And, we still hold that the highest expression of religious living is achieved when men love God with all their hearts and minds and souls, and their neighbors as themselves. These great truths, and others which could be mentioned, still stand as the basis for the values around which we are convinced life must be integrated, and our programs of Christian education still have as their objective the acceptance of these truths and of the values growing out of them. These things have not changed with the coming of the scourge of war, nor do they change as we face the post war world.

So far what has been said seems to imply a sort of "business as usual" policy for religious education in these war times. If, prior to the coming of war, religious education had really been doing it's job this would probably be true. Indeed we might not even be in a war time. I say this because of a conviction that if Christian education had really been doing the job

it should have been doing in relation to the tension areas and problems which faced our culture in the interim between the close of the first world war and the outbreak of the second, the second might never have come. But the second world war, or the global war if you prefer that term, has come. It has brought into bold relief certain problems and tensions, certain areas of experience which need enrichment and control and understanding. They are not entirely new areas of experience nor are the problems they present entirely new. The most that can be said in an attempt to present them as uniquely war and post war problems is that the present struggle has set them in *bold relief* and created a certain urgency in relation to them, and that they represent areas of experience which *must* be dealt with *adequately* if there is to be any hope for a permanent peace and any hope for abundance of living.

The first of these areas which I want to mention is the area of international relationships. We have been, and still are, living in a state of international anarchy. The prevailing attitude and mind set has been that of nationalism. Each nation has been thought of as responsible only for it's own welfare, and as being responsible only to *itself* for its actions. When the interests of one nation conflicted with those of another, war or the threat of war, determined the solution of the conflict. The strong imposed their will upon the weak. The strong took what they wanted.

The League of Nations represented one attempt to deal with this International Anarchy. It was disowned shortly after its birth by the country whose President fathered it. If, perchance, religious education had been less interested in having people memorize the Bible, or learn a creed, or come to accept the proper theology so that they might be "saved by their faith", in the narrow sense in which Protestantism has used that phrase; and had been more interested in helping growing persons discover what the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of man, and loving one's neighbor as one's self, meant in terms of the place of the United States in the world of nations, it might not be necessary for another generation of Christian young men to find a way of convincing themselves that the spirit of love and brotherhood can be adequately expressed by way of bombs, machine gun bullets, and hand grenades.

Entirely apart from what might have been if we had acted differently in the past, the fact remains that solutions must be

found for the problems in the area of international relations if Tomorrow's World is to have freedom from war and want and fear. Our civilization cannot long endure if our total resources and energies are to continue, periodically, to be directed toward destruction, as is necessary in total war. The nations of the world must find a way to live together as a family of nations.

One of the essentials for this living together as a family of nations is the creation of an international mind, or to say the same thing another way, the expanding of our loyalties to include all nations and peoples. The history of civilization has been one of expanding loyalties. Beginning with the time when man was loyal only to himself and to his own interests, in the narrow sense of such loyalty, history records the growth of ever more inclusive loyalties. After man's loyalty to himself alone, there came a loyalty to his family and his kinsman. This loyalty expanded to include the clan or tribe. Then tribes and clans joined to become nations and the larger and more inclusive loyalty replaced the more narrow one. We are now faced with the necessity of expanding our loyalties again. This time we must transcend the narrower loyalty to nations and enter into the larger one of loyalty to a world of nations or a family of nations.

This sets the task for Christian education in this area. If there are to be citizens for this family of nations some one must educate them. I am not suggesting that all of this education must be done by Christian education. On the other hand Christian education cannot be insensitive to its responsibilities in this area. Just as in the past it has seen its responsibility for Christian citizenship in relation to the narrower nationalistic loyalty, so now must it see its responsibility in relation to this larger loyalty. It must see it and assume it for the same reasons that secular education must, and it must come home with a special sense of urgency because living in terms of this larger loyalty is so much a part of the demands of the Christian faith. This faith has called men to live under God as a Father-God. Corollary to this has been an insistence upon the Brotherhood of Man and the necessity for living in brotherly relationships with *all* men. Essentially this larger loyalty, of which we have been thinking is an expression of these basic elements in our faith.

The second area of tension, which a war and post war world brings to us with special urgency, has to do with the

relations between the white and colored races of the world. In recent centuries we have been living in a white man's world. The leadership in world affairs and the power to exercise that leadership has resided in the white man. We have gone to the ends of the earth and by our superior power of arms have subjected the colored races. Some times we have driven them from their lands and confined them on reservations, as was done in this country. In other instances we have simply gone in and established ourselves as the master race leaving the native population to toil under our direction. Sometimes we have torn members of colored races from their native lands and transported them to our own, there to toil under our direction. In each of these instances, save in our own country in relation to our treatment of the American Indians, we have definitely set ourselves up as the master race, and, lest we as Americans feel too self-righteous over our treatment of the Indians, let us be reminded that there is nothing too glorious in penning a people up on a reservation, and, let us be reminded also that we were among the worst sinners when it came to tearing people from their native lands and forcing them into slavery.

In fairness it must be said that we of the white race have taken many benefits to those over whom we have established ourselves. Whatever our motive in doing so, and often it has been of the highest as in the case of the missionary enterprise, I am personally convinced that the lot of many colonial peoples and of the negroes in our own country has been vastly improved by even a servant-master contact with the white man's culture. This does not alter the fact that the white man has set himself up as a superior being—as the master race.

I have deliberately used this "master-race" phrase because of its association in our thinking with the point of view of one, who for some reason, does not like the name "Shickelgruber". I have used it to call attention to the way we react when some one or some group proposes to be our superiors and plans to relegate us to the position of servant people. I need not describe that reaction in detail. All I need to say is that it is violent enough to play a large part in turning a peace loving, near isolationist, nation like our own into one which is doing a good job of going all out for war.

Perhaps, if we can keep in mind our own reaction to the Nazi regime with its idea of a dominant master race which is

to rule over the other peoples, we can sense, in some measure, the ferment that is going on among the colored peoples of the world. The situation is not exactly parallel of course. They do not represent peoples threatened with subjection. Instead they are peoples moving upward toward freedom and equality. They are struggling for something which they do not have rather than struggling to hold something which they have had. Furthermore, their leaders, at least, cannot but recognize the difference between the rather benevolent imperialism if the British Empire and of the Dutch, and the sort of thing which would likely be their lot under German or Japanese domination. That the difference is not as great in their minds as it is in ours is indicated, however, by the fact that Burma and India and others have not *rushed* to the side of the United Nations. Instead, there has often been support of Japan or an attitude which suggests that it does not seem to make much difference to these colonial peoples who their over-lords are to be as long as they have to have over-lords. Even China has had her times of doubt as indicated by the kind of questions asked of Wendell Wilkie with respect to the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter beyond the white race. In this connection it is of more than passing interest to recall that one of the syndicated newspaper columns suggested that one of the reasons Chiang Kai-shek did not attend the Casablanca conference was that he did not dare leave China long enough to participate in the conference for fear that control of the Chungking government would be taken over by men convinced that there was no hope for China as long as she linked herself with occidental powers.

The seriousness of this situation was brought home to me with new power when I heard two different men, both qualified by experience to know what they were talking about, say that if the United Nations failed to deal with the oriental powers on a basis of equality during this conflict and especially in the reconstruction period following the war we could expect the orient to line up with Russia in a new alignment of powers which would probably mean that the next war would be between the West and the East. God help us if this happens! Let the industrialization of China and Russia go forward as it will after this conflict is over. Let these countries be in a position to use the vast natural resources of these areas and others of the Far East. Then let them call upon their vast resources of man power and turn against the western world—the white man's

world. The conflict that would result would be terrible beyond our imagining.

So far nothing has been said about the racial tensions within our own borders. There is no question about the existence of these tensions and the problems they present. The question of white domination is as acute here as in the orient. I do not mean to suggest that I think we are in danger of armed revolt any time in the near future, if ever, by the colored citizens of the United States. I *do* mean to suggest that we (the whites) cannot continue to talk about things like the four freedoms and democracy, and continue discriminations against the colored races, without there coming to be a great increase in tensions; increasing acts of violence; and without laying the foundations for race riots and other such manifestations.

As in relation to the international tensions the task and responsibility of Christian Education are clear. It is that of growing a generation of Christians both white and colored who show by their acts that they believe that God is the Father of all and that all men are brothers—that in the sight of God there are neither Jews nor Gentiles, Greeks nor Barbarians, or, to say the same thing in twentieth century language—neither white nor colored in the sight of God. It follows, of course, that those who seek to express the spirit of God follow Him in His lack of discrimination on the basis of race.

I am not suggesting that this will be easy to do, and it will be most difficult on the home front. It will be much easier for us to grant equality to China and other colored nations in the affairs of nations than it will be for us to do the same thing to individual Negroes, Chinese, and Japanese living in America. Even those whites who have transcended their own racial prejudices find themselves in situations that are so complex that they hardly know what to do. It has been my experience, however, that much of the tension in racial situations can be relieved if those who are discriminated against can be convinced of the sincerity of purpose of those who are caught in social situations where the full expression of the Christian spirit is not feasible. The least we can do is seek to develop such a spirit of sincerity. The citizens of tomorrow's World will need such a spirit if they are to deal effectively and on a Christian basis with what Lothrop Stoddard once called "the rising tide of color."

The third area of tension is economic. Like the others which have been considered this is not a new area, however, like the others, it is brought to us with special urgency in these days, or at least it should be. Perhaps it is not so apparent to many people for as yet for the heady wine of prosperity based on war spending has eased the immediate economic tensions for many. Indeed, many are living in a fool's paradise as far as money is concerned. Farm prices are good. Jobs are plentiful and, in the main, wages are high. Rationing and the inability to buy whatever one pleases causes some inconvenience, and there is plenty of grumbling about increased taxes. But, for the majority there is nothing like the economic worries and fears which harrassed millions following 1929. Only those on fixed salaries which have been just about adequate to their needs, face any real worries as yet. The day of reckoning will come however, and those who have thought about the situation view the future with great apprehension.

The most immediate problem will be that of returning millions of men to civilian occupations. Jobs, jobs, and more jobs will be necessary and where will we find them? The immediate situation may be cared for by the rush to replace our worn out automobiles, refrigerators, and other items of consumer's goods. We may even have a boom period followed by the inevitable collapse—another cycle of "Boom and Bust" to use the language of another. If, so we will only postpone the day of reckoning unless we find the way of increasing the purchasing power of the masses of working people. If this is to be done there must be a more equitable distribution of income and of the profits of our economic processes. How likely this is to happen can be judged by the opposition which has arisen to the President's suggestion that personal income be limited to $25,000.00 as a war measure. Be that as it may, it seems clear that the only way we can stave off an economic collapse in the years following the war is to find some way of stopping the trend described aptly by President McLain of Transylvania recently in the words of a popular song of several years back which announced that "the rich get richer and the poor get children." This much is certain. Some way must be found, in the economy of abundance which our technological skill has given us, to increase the purchasing power of the masses if we are to escape economic disaster in the post-war period.

What has all this to do with Christian Education? Well, it has at least this much to do with it. It is inconceivable that

we will be loving our neighbors very realistically if we sit idly by and watch them starve. Men cannot live very abundantly on empty stomachs. Jesus recognized this and he placed enough store by "daily bread" to include reference to it in the prayer which he taught his Disciples to pray. "Give us this day our daily bread" were his words. And, when the day of judgment was pictured, those who were placed on the right hand of the king to receive the rewards of having served the king were those who had fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and performed other such acts. And, interestingly enough no questions were asked as to the correctness of their theology, or how they had been baptised, or any of the other things we are inclined to emphasize so much in organized religion. Without even suggesting that these things are not important, and certainly without wishing even to imply that they do not have an important place, is it too much to suggest that whether people are going to have enough to eat and a chance to live decently is also a primary concern of the Christian faith? Is it true, as the communists like to say, that Christianity promises "pie in the sky" as a substitute for economic justice and a square meal in this life?

What is religious education to do? One thing is that it must grow a generation of Christians who see the relationship of the Christian ethic to our economic and business relationships. A friend of mine, a professor of economics in a southwestern university once said that what he would like to do most of all would be to have the chair of Christian Ethics in some college and then, to use his exact words, "teach economics like hell." This, in more picturesque language, is something of what I am trying to say. More prosaically it is that we must grow a generation of Christians, who to say the least, are ready voluntarily to limit their personal income if they are in the employing and land owning group, in order that those who work for them receive a greater share of the profits accruing from the conduct of their business or farming—a generation ready to support legislation and programs which will improve the lot of the dispossessed—a generation that will see its Christian responsibility in the realm of economics as something more than playing Lord or Lady Bountiful to the poor by supporting charitable organizations. What is needed is not more charity but more opportunity for men to earn an adequate living by their own efforts.

One other area of tension resulting in a peculiar sense from war must be mentioned. It is in the realm of the personal ethics of persons. Any situation in a culture which tears people from their usual and familiar surroundings makes for a breakdown of that person's accepted habit patterns, mores, and ethical standards, or at least brings these into question. I can illustrate what I mean from my personal experience. I grew up in a community where nice people did not dance or play cards. I questioned very little, if any, the validity of the community judgment that these things were wrong. Then I went from my home community to a university community. Because nice people in my home community went to church I hunted one up. Before long I was urged to attend the regular Friday evening dinner at the church. I went, with the pattern of church dinners in my home church in mind which called for the dinner and then a religious service afterward. At this university church the pattern was followed as far as the dinner was concerned, save that the dinner was better and more expensive. It varied abruptly immediately after the dinner for some of the group made their way to an upper room and danced for the rest of the evening. *Even* the *preacher* went with this group and *danced*. Others of the group went to another room and played bridge. Look where I would I could not find my religious speech. Here I found nice people doing the things nice people were not supposed to do. My traditional mores and standards were dealt a blow. This sort of thing happens inevitably when a person leaves his usual and familiar environment and ventures into a different one.

Since this is the case, imagine what is happening to millions of people these days—the millions who are on the move as a result of induction into the armed forces—the almost equal number who have been lured away from their familiar surroundings by defense work. Imagine also what is happening to young men in North Africa, the Solomons, and in the other far corners of the world coming in contact, as they are, with strange customs, habits, and practices. Think what all this is doing to their previously accepted standards of belief and conduct. Think also what will happen in the communities to which they return after the war is over when they come back to assume their life in their old surroundings. Add to this the shift that young men in the armed forces have had to make from an ethic which said that killing was the greatest crime to one which places skill in killing high in the scale of virtues and it is

easy to see why ethical tensions will arise. This is only one of the shifts in ethical point of view necessitated by war. Furthermore, this shift is not limited to the men in the armed forces though it is most pronounced among them. All along the line modern war tends to reverse peace time ethics. This is continually brought home to me, with a force I cannot ignore, when I hear kindergarten and first and second grade children in my neighborhood singing a song which includes these words "We'll slap the Japs, the dirty little Japs" and when my own four year old daughter comes running in excitedly to say, "Turn out all the lights. The 'Gaps' (she has trouble with her "J"'s) are coming", or "The Germans are going to get me". What a far cry from what we have been trying to do in the way of building understanding and appreciation of other races, and of establishing good will between us and them!

What is the task of Christian Education? Basically it is that of helping persons achieve a broad basis for, and skill in, the making of moral and ethical judgments. In times of less flux in the realm of ethical and moral standards it *may be* enough to transmit to an oncoming generation the mores, behavior, patterns and standards of the existing culture. You will note that I have said "*may be*" for I have serious question in my own mind as to whether this transmissive process is *ever* enough in a process world such as ours. Be that as it may, it seems clear as crystal that this will not be enough in these war days and in the post-war days to follow. Instead of persons who accept the mores and standards passed on to them we must have persons who are capable of judging and evaluating conflicting standards and differing ways of acting. They must be able to recognize that which is good and choose it. They cannot "catch" their morals from their culture because that culture will be too full of conflicting and contradictory standards and practice. This has been true of our "melting pot" American culture even in peace times but it will be very much more true of the culture of the post-war period.

There are other areas of tension brought to the fore by the present crisis but these which have been mentioned seem to me to be the major ones. I have probably dealt with them at too great length. I have felt impelled to do so, however. I am afraid that a psychiatrist seeking to understand that impulsion might say that I have done it as a way of delaying the time

when I would have to say something more concrete and practical about growing Citizens for Tomorrow's World.

There is probably good and sufficient ground for such an observation. I confess to a very great desire to stop at this point. It is so much easier to say what should be done than it is to say concretely *how* it should be done. This is especially true as far as I am concerned as I face the problem of how to develop Citizens for Tomorrow's World. One reason for this is the fact that we do not even know what Tomorrow's World will be like. Will it be a world with some form of world government in which all nations, East and West, Victor and Vanquished, will plan as equals for the welfare of man; or will it be a world in which a combination of Anglo-Saxon powers seeks to impose its will on the world—a continuation on a narrower scale of White Dominance? Will we find the way of increasing the purchasing power of the masses or will the rich continue to get richer and the poor poorer? And so I could continue. What will Tomorrow's World be like?

A further complication arises from the fact that many of those with whom we will work in our church schools will have little to say about the nature of Tomorrow's World. With the possible exception of those of High School age and above, those with whom we will be working will have to *live* in Tomorrow's World. but they will have little voice in determining it. The world of day after tomorrow is the one they will build. Consequently we are faced with the problem of educating citizens for a world, the nature of which is largely in the balance, and a world about which many of those with whom we will be dealing can do little because of their immaturity and lack of power. Is it any wonder that I would like to stop? I must say something, however.

First of all I want to suggest what seems to me to be an important principle to keep in mind. It is that preparation of Citizens for Tomorrow's World has to be done in terms of helping people deal adequately, and on a Christian basis, with the present. If tomorrow's citizens are to love their enemies, are to work for economic justice, are to deal with people of other races on a basis of equality, are to decide moral issues in terms of the Good, they have to begin doing it now. In the words of the title of a book of several months past, "Their Future is Now."

Fortunately, for our purposes, the tensions and problems which will confront the Citizens of Tomorrow's World are with

us now. We do not have to deal with international problems, racial tensions, economic injustices and inequalities, and conflicting ethical and moral standards in our imagination nor in terms of what is to be in a post-war world. These things are with us with real urgency in these days. Our place to take hold in preparing citizens for tomorrow's world is at the point of these tensions and problems in the present experience of those who are under our care. We must begin now to help those who are in our churches to love Japanese, Germans and Italians as well as British and Russians; to develop concern for the good of all and not for just their own national group; to make moral decisions in terms of what is good. This is essential if we prepare Citizens for Tomorrow's World.

As to how to do this I must confess to having no new techniques or approaches, and certainly no magic cure-all. So far as I know there is nothing to which we can turn other than the tested methods such as the study and discussion of the problems and issues involved, the engaging in projects and services activities, the educational use of the drama technique, of handwork, of recreational activities, etc., the sharing of experiences of appreciation of other peoples, worship, and other things which might be mentioned. The only difference which I can suggest is in the realm of the content used to guide and enrich the experiences which are undertaken. By way of illustration let me suggest that we need to exalt the late George Washington Carver, as well as George Washington, Sun Yat Sen as well as Lincoln, Kagawa as well as Jane Addams and Muriel Lester; that we need especially to call attention to the fine characteristics of Japanese and Germans as well as those of the English, Chinese and ourselves. Obversely, we need to help growing persons realize that all of virtue is not on our side of controversial issues and that we have not been above questionable tactics such as our opponents have used. Who, but the blindest of partisans, can fail to see the similarity between the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and the United Nations landings in North Africa—a soil under the sovereignty of a nation with which we were maintaining diplomatic relationships and with which we were at peace. This is not to condemn our own activities. It is rather to help maintain perspective, and clearness of insight, with respect to other peoples. In a sense what I am suggesting is that we see others as we see ourselves, instead of following only Bobby Burns injunction to see ourselves

as others see us. Both things are valuable and we should seek to see ourselves through the eyes of Germans, Italians, and Japanese. At the same time we should see their actions toward us as we would see them if we were in their situation. Perhaps then their treacheries might become military necessity—their battle one of self defense—their concentration camps as necessary as our Japanese relocation centers.

Perhaps, if we can guide our people in such an understanding of our enemies they will be the kind of people who can take their place in Tomorrow's World as world minded citizens. Perhaps such an understanding will replace hatred with love and concern for the welfare of our enemies. Perhaps it will help us transcend our desire for reparations and revenge and enable us to build for a just and durable peace, and, we must remember, as Hoover and Gibson have reminded us, that we can have *revenge* or a *lasting peace,* but we can't have both. Perhaps such an understanding will enable us to love our enemies and do good to those who we are inclined to say have despitefully used us. Perhaps it can lead us to realize that the way to overcome *evil* is to do it with *good.*

This same sort of understanding must be built up between groups involved in the other tension areas mentioned. Privileged people must be lead to understand the yearnings, longings, and frustrations of the underprivileged. Underprivileged people must understand themselves and those who are more privileged. Both sides of labor and racial difficulties must be seen. Those of us who lead in religion must mediate this understanding.

Along with this attempt to build understanding as a basis for finding Christian solutions to the problems which confront this war and post war period there must be also a direct approach to these problems. I have tried to suggest that understanding lays the ground work for the attitude of love which must underlie any Christian solution. We cannot stop with the creation of such attitudes, however. A feeling of love and concern for others is no assurance that our actions will be of such a nature as to make for the resolving of the tension areas we face in these days. In addition to creating such an attitude we must deal concretely and specifically with the problems involved in these tension areas and find our way through to intelligent and practical solutions or partial solutions. We must bring the various proposals for bringing order out of the chaos

of war and for planning for a new world order under the scrutiny of our best judgment and thinking to discover which is the most loving way. We must evaluate the various proposals for dealing with our economic problems in the light of the Christian ideal of the greatest good for the greatest number. Communism, socialism, the cooperative movement, capitalism (modified and unmodified), and any others, must have serious consideration. Our traditional ethical standards and mores must be lifted up for the same kind of critical study in so far as they come to be called in question.

In all of this there must be a minimum of trying to defend the old and the accepted. We must not rationalize. We must do our best to think our way through to Christian solutions. Some of these may be the old ones—many of them will be. They must not be accepted or defended because they are old, or because they are in the Bible, or because Jesus said them, however, but because they are the best answers we can discover.

Then we must enlist those in our schools in what, for want of a better name, I will call "Mercy Activities" rather than war activities. They will be urged into the latter through the public school and other community agencies, and they will participate in these. In this connection I am raising no issue with respect to the various war activities. In relation to them we should do everything we can to keep participation from being motivated by hatred of our enemies, but, since what I am calling Mercy Activities are so much more in harmony with the Christian Spirit we should emphasize them and enlist the energies of those in our groups in them. I have in mind such things as the Red Cross, Aid to Refugees, and other such activities.

In so far as the exigencies of a war time will permit we should cross the lines of battle in these activities. For instance, we should engage in service activities in relation to the Japanese in the evacuation centers. It would be splendid if for every dollar given for relief of those on our side of the present conflict an equal amount could be set aside for relief and reconstruction inside our enemy countries after the war is over. If, in the present situation, we could lead those under our care to such an expression of concern for our enemies, we might hope for a genuine spirit of good will to develop after the war is over.

Many of these things I have been suggesting are dangerous to do in times like these. Even though we exercise the greatest of tact and consideration, we are likely, if we do them, to be

called pro-nazi, or pro-facist, or pro-japanese, or something else of the sort. It seems to me that it is necessary for us to do them, however, if we are to help produce Citizens for Tomorrow's World. Doing them, and other things like them, will give a basis for sympathy and understanding and good will between the many peoples on opposite sides of battle lines, economic issues, and the color line. We will need these if we are to be Christian in a warring and post-war world.

One last thing I want to say. It is that the most important thing we can do to help grow Citizens for Tomorrow's World is to be, ourselves, the kind of people they must be. We must refrain from hating. We must transcend our racial prejudices and our narrow nationalistic loyalties. We must have the spirit of love for all men burning in our hearts. That love must be guided by information and knowledge with respect to the facts on both sides of the various tension areas confronting our culture. We must get those facts and that knowledge to the degree that it is possible. We must strive *now* to be Citizens of Tomorrow's World in order that by our example we may show the way to others.

These things then, we, who guide Christian education must do as a result of facing a warring and post-war world. They are not the only things we must do. Many of the more traditional concerns of religious education must be continued. If, however, we view our warring and post-war task realistically these things must be given a large place. To do otherwise would be to run away from our call to bring about the doing of the will of God "on earth as it is in heaven."